

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Final Office Action mailed June 22, 2005 and the Advisory Action mailed December 9, 2005. Reconsideration of this application in view of the below remarks is respectfully requested. Claims 25-56 are pending in the application with Claims 25, 36, 41, 45 and 48 being in independent form. By the present amendment, Claims 36, 41 and 44 have been amended. No new subject matter has been introduced into the disclosure by way of the present amendment.

Regarding the Examiner's assertion that the claimed 'dissemination means' is not supported in the specification, the 'dissemination means' is represented by the 'electronic information distribution apparatus' represented by reference numeral 100 in FIG. 2 and FIG. 3.

In response, Claims 36, 41 and 44 have been amended to replace the term "dissemination means" with "electronic information distribution means" in an effort to further clarify the distinguishing features of the claimed invention.

Support for the above-identified amendment can be found on page 17, lines 15-24, wherein an electronic information distribution apparatus 100 is described as: "...conveniently and flexibly provides that information signals can be routed or disseminated from the apparatus 100..." (Emphasis added). Consequently, the electronic information distribution apparatus 100 can be described as a dissemination means since it provides that information signals can be disseminated from it.

I. Rejection of Claims 41 and 44 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 41 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,043,531 issued to Gutenson et al.

Regarding the prior art reference of Gutenson et al., the Examiner contends that the reference fully anticipates all the claimed elements recited in Claims 41 and 44. However, Gutenson fails to disclose the 'dissemination means' (i.e., electronic information distribution means) as defined above. Specifically, Gutenson teaches a service center 32 having a coax gateway, telephone gateway, load center, and control and data communication system. However, there are no indications that multiple connectors for each gateway/system are present. In fact, Gutenson requires a separate coaxial cable splitter 80 to distribute the coaxial signal from the service center 32 to the multiple rooms in the building. (See: Gutenson et al., FIG. 2).

Contrastingly, the electronic information distribution means of the present application contains a plurality of connectors of several types, e.g., coaxial, RJ-45, RJ-11, fiber-optic, etc., as shown in FIG. 3 of the present application. Therefore, a separate router is not necessary. Accordingly, Claims 41 and 44 are believed patentably distinct and allowable over the cited prior art references.

II. Rejection of Claims 25-29, 31-35, 42 and 43 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 25-29, 31-35, 42 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentably obvious over Gutenson et al.

Gutenson et al. fails to disclose a second and third set of connectors connected to the support means. As mentioned above, Gutenson et al. require a separate router 80 for distributing coaxial cable to a plurality of rooms. As for distribution of telephone wires, there is no mention of multiple telephone connectors located on the Gutenson et al. disclosed support means. In fact, the implication from FIG. 2 is that wiring for internal electrical power and for telephones are run along the walls, serially, from room to room, as depicted by lines 46A and 46B and thus would

not be individually assigned, at the support means, to individual rooms as claimed in independent Claim 25.

Consequently, Gutenson et al. fails to disclose or suggest a first set of connectors connected to the support means, the first set of connectors including a coaxial cable connector, an optical fiber connector, and a twisted pair connector, the first set of connectors adapted for conveying electronic information signals between the central location and the first room; a second set of connectors connected to the support means, the second set of connectors including a coaxial cable connector, an optical fiber connector, and a twisted pair connector, the second set of connectors conveying electronic information signals between the central location and the second room; and a third set of connectors connected to the support means, the third set of connectors including a coaxial cable connector, an optical fiber connector, and a twisted pair connector, the third set of connectors conveying electronic information signals between the central location and the third room, as recited in independent Claim 25.

In addition, Claims 26-29, 31-35, 42 and 43 depend from independent Claims 25 and 41 and thus include the limitations of these independent claims. Therefore, for at least the reasons given above regarding Claims 41 and 25, Claims 26-29, 31-35, 42 and 43 are believed patentably distinct and allowable over Gutenson et al.

III. Rejection of Claims 36-40 and 45-47 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 36-40 and 45-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentably obvious over Gutenson et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,869,582 issued to Humphrey et al.

As discussed above, Gutenson et al. fails to disclose an electronic information distribution means as recited in the claims and further described in Applicants' disclosure.

Humphrey et al. discloses an intra-building telephone system, which allows assignment of telephone extensions to individual phones from a central telephone patch box. However, Humphrey et al. requires multiple incoming telephone lines equal in number to the number of extensions being assigned.

For the sake of argument, if the splitter 80 of Gutenson et al. were taken as the electronic information distribution means, as asserted by the Examiner, Humphrey et al. would not be applicable in modifying the splitter as the Examiner requires in order to disclose Applicants' recited limitations. A coaxial splitter 80 as known in the art is basically, constructed from several connectors spliced together, such that one connector acts as an input and the remaining connectors act as outputs. (See: RadioShack model no. 15-1234 for an example of a coaxial splitter). The splitter 80 of Gutenson et al. is not suggested to be anything other than this simple type of coaxial splitter nor would a more complex type of device be necessary for the Gutenson et al. system to function as intended. Therefore, there is no proper motivation to combine Gutenson et al. and Humphrey et al. Accordingly, Claims 36-40 and 45-47 are believed patentably distinct and allowable over the cited prior art references.

IV. Rejection of Claims 30 and 48-56 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 30 and 48-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentably obvious over Gutenson et al. in view of Applicants' disclosure. Claims 30 and 48-56 depend from independent Claims 25 and 45 and thus include the limitations recited in these independent claims. Therefore, for at least the reasons given above for Claims 25 and 45, Claims 30 and 48-56 are believed patentably distinct and allowable over the cited prior art references.

CONCLUSIONS

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all claims presently pending in the application, namely, Claims 25-56 are believed to be in condition for allowance and patentably distinguishable over the art of record.

If the Examiner should have any questions concerning this communication or feels that an interview would be helpful, the Examiner is requested to call Applicant's undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Esatto, Jr.

Registration No. 30,749

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER
400 Garden City Plaza - Ste. 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343

PJE:DAT:jam